

### REMARKS

The objections, rejections and comments of the Examiner set forth in the Office Action dated August 27, 2003 have been carefully reviewed by the Applicants. Claims 1-6 have been withdrawn. Claims 7-13 are currently rejected and Claims 14-20 are objected to.

The drawings are currently objected to because Figures 1-4 lack a designation as prior art. In response, the designation "Prior Art" has been added to each of Figures 1-4. Replacement sheets of the drawings including amended Figures 1-4 are attached.

Claims 7-12 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moon (US 6229695). In response, Claim 7 and Claims 8-12 (by dependence upon Claim 7), have been amended to patentably distinguish the present claimed invention from Moon. Specifically, Claim 7 has been amended to recite a " carrier frame comprising at least one electrically conductive frame contact for establishing electrical contact with a touch panel" that is neither taught nor suggested by Moon. Support for the amendment is provided in the specification at page 13, lines 4-10.

The rejection points to item 40 of figure 2 of Moon as disclosing a frame contact, that is, there exist points of contact between the frame and other elements of the device. Amended Claim 7 recites a frame contact that is electrically conductive for establishing contact to a touch panel. Moon does not provide an electrical frame contact for establishing contact to a touch panel. The touch panel electrical connections of Moon are described simply as "well known" at column 4, lines 52-53.

The frame disclosed by Moon has ribs that are used to support the PCB and LCD display, but Moon is silent with respect to the ribs providing any type of electrical contact. The frame of Moon does not provide the electrical connection between the disclosed PCB and LCD panel. It appears that the frame of Moon has no discernible electrical function other than as an insulator.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art. The prior art discloses a visually homogeneous non-transparent conductive pattern and a visually homogeneous adhesive dielectric spacer. The rejection also offers that the rejection can be overcome by

stating that they both have approximately equal visual homogeneous appearance.

In response to the rejection, Claim 13 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's instructions to recite "a visible non-transparent conductive pattern adjacent to a visible adhesive dielectric spacer, wherein said visible non-transparent conductive pattern and said adhesive dielectric spacer have an approximately equal visual homogeneous appearance."

Claims 14-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (Claim 13), but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowability of Claims 14-20. In response, the Applicants have amended the rejected base claim (Claim 13) in order to overcome its rejection, in accordance with the Examiner's instructions.

Independent Claim 7 has been amended to recite an electrically conductive frame contact that is neither taught nor suggested by Moon. Independent Claim 13 has been amended to


overcome the rejection, per the Examiner's instructions. In summary, Applicants assert that Claims 7-20 are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit such action by the Examiner.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: November 25, 2003

  
Mehlin Dean Matthews  
Registration Number: 46,127

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

408-938-9060